



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

72

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,605	02/19/2002	Michael John Branson	ROC920010345US1	5551

46797 7590 10/31/2006

IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW
DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

BHATIA, AJAY M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2145

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

OCT 31 2006

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/078,605
Filing Date: February 19, 2002
Appellant(s): BRANSON ET AL.

Michael John Branson et al.
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 9/20/06 appealing from the Office action mailed 3/21/02.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,668,254	Matson et al.	12-2003
5,949,117	Landry	7-1997

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,668,254) in view of Landry (U.S. Patent 5,649,117).

For claim 1, Matson et al. teaches, a method of maintaining a database for managing a process of a plurality of transactions through two or more application in a business transaction environment, each application having at least one associated log file, and (see Matson et al. , Col. 2 lines 61-67, Col. 3 lines 9-16)

accessing each of the respective associated log files, wherein at least two of the associated log files are of different formats; (see Matson et al. , abstract, Col. 3 lines 9-16)

for each new log files are of different formats; (see Matson et al. , abstract, Col. 3 lines 9-16)

for each new log entry recorded in the respective associated log file being accessed:

(i) determining whether the new log entry comprises one or more required fields using mapping rules that describe a location and format of at least the one or more required fields in the respective associated log file: (see Matson et al. , Col. 3 lines 9-16, Col. 4 lines 16-21, Col. 5 lines 16-21, Col. 5 lines 22-38, new log entries are mapped in to fields in the XML file)

(ii) extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry comprises the one or more required fields; (see Matson et al. , Col. 6 lines 14-16)

and (iii) storing the information as a plurality of transaction records to a database. (see Matson et al. , Col. 9 lines 47-60)

Matson et al. fails to clearly disclose, each transaction being defined by one or more steps configured to complete the transaction, the method comprising:

Landry teaches, each transaction being defined by one or more steps configured to complete the transaction, the method comprising: (see Landry, figure 2A&B)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Matson et al.'s system of processing new data into a data into a database with Landry's method of defining records as transactions, since it is well known in the art that a database is designed to hold any type of record, and it would be obvious to make use of the database to support as many types of records, in order to increase the profitability of the database application by having an increased user base (more users are able to buy and use the product). (see Matson et al. , Col. 2 Col. 61-67, Matson et al. provides for uses other than on-line shopping)

For claim 2, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising receiving a notification message from the respective associated log file indicating that the new log entry has been recorded in the respective associated log file. (see Matson et al. , Col. 4 lines 35-53, by doing a diff, the system is able to differentiate if a new log entry is filed)

For claim 4, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the information is extracted from the new log entry using the mapping rules providing the format and the location of the information in the new log entry. (see Matson et al. , Col. 5 lines 16-21, Col. 5 lines 22-38, new log entries are mapped in to fields in the XML file)

For claim 5, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising determining whether the plurality of transaction records satisfies an undesirable condition; (see Matson et al., Col. 6 lines 24-28, undesired condition is that record is missing information)

and executing an action responsive to the undesirable condition if the plurality of transactions satisfies the condition. (see Matson et al. , Col. 6 lines 24-28, records are moved the fault data file, this is the action to the undesirable condition)

For claim 6, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the condition is whether a number of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions exceeds a predefined numerical limit. (see Matson et al. , Col. 8 lines 1-19, it would be obvious to make the response to the condition to trust the results)

For claim 7, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the condition is whether any of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions has a time duration exceeding a predefined time limit. (see Landry, Col. 7 lines 20-29) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 7.

For claim 8, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein executing the action comprises sending a notification message alerting the condition.

(see Landry, Col. 31 lines 36-53) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 8.

For claim 9, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the action comprises executing a computer program for resolving the condition. (see Landry, Col. 30 lines 7-21) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 9.

For claim 10, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the one or more required fields comprises at least one of a transaction identifier, a step identifier, and a time stamp. (see Matson et al. , Col. 6 lines 24-29) and (see Landry, figure 2A&B, Col. 13 lines 35-60) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 10.

For claim 11, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 10, wherein step identifier is a unique identifier associated with a step of the transaction. (see Landry, Col. 13 lines 35-60, Col. 34 lines 14-44) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 11.

For claim 12, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 10, wherein the time stamp indicates a time at which the step started. (see Landry, Col. 30 lines 8-21)

The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 12.

For claim 13, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the information comprises at least one of a transaction type, a transaction origin, and a transaction destination, the transaction type, the transaction origin and the transaction destination identifying the transaction record. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 13.

For claim 14, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the transaction type describes the type of transaction. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 14.

For claim 15, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the transaction origin describes an entity that originated the transaction. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 15.

For claim 16, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the transaction destination describes a final destination of the transaction. (see Landry,

Art Unit: 2145

figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 16.

For claim 17, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein storing the information comprises storing the information to the database as one of a transaction record and a step record, the transaction record being defined by one or more step records. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 17.

For claim 18, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein the information comprises at least one of a step type and a step location, the step type and the step location identifying the step record. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 18.

For claim 19, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 18, wherein the step type describes the operation performed by one of the two or more applications at the time the new log entry is recorded. (see Landry, figure 2A&B ,Col. 34 lines 14-44) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 19.

For claim 20, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 18, wherein the step location describes a computer of at least one of the two or more applications. (see Landry, figure 2A&B, Col. 34 lines 14-44) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 20.

Claims 21-30 list all the same elements of claims 1-2, 3-20, but in computer readable medium and system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-2, 3-20 applies equally as well to claims 21-30.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's first argument is addressing the application of Matson in teaching the limitation "determining whether the new log entry comprises one or more required fields using mapping rules that describe a location and format of at least the one or more required fields in the respective associated log file." In understanding the application of Matson it is necessary to understand the cited portion of the prior art. Matson discuss the parsing of a XML file with a DTD (document type definition) this DTD describes the content of the associated file like a key. Examiner is providing an example of DTD and a XML, this knowledge is well known to one of skill in the art of the present invention. From this information it is clear each field of the document is specified each field in the document. In identifying the specific format for the supplier it would identify if the correct fields are present in the related document Col. 5 lines 27-30 of Matson.

Appellant's 2nd argument is addressing the limitation "extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry comprises the one or more required fields." Matson disclose in Col. 6 lines 10-23 discarding of the entire file since none of the necessary fields are present in the file. This is prior to extracting of data with the parsing process; therefore the process is only completed on the files with new data fields that are required by the system. It appears applicant is has elected to selective read the prior art in view of applicants claim. Examiner has applied the entire reference, which shows prior art for the claim limitation.

Appellant's 3rd argument is addressing the limitation "mapping rules." Examiner provided appellant with a clarification of how parsing occurs. Each of the fields is extracted from the file being identified with the specific field when it is extracted. The Matson matched this information using regular expressions Col. 5 lines 39-57. In view of appellants arguments appellants appears to have ignored the context of the parsing. By parsing in a XML environment the prior art is beyond the basic grammatical structure, since this grammatical structure is significant since it identifies the fields. Therefore in prior art in context is inherently mapping the data.

Appellant's 4th arguments are reason for combining the items. (Form PP about reason to combine). As describe in the action both items are in the field of database systems, making them analogues systems. Matson is compatible with Landry because Matson in the prior art allows for other uses other the on-line shopping Col. 32

Art Unit: 2145

lines 61-67. Additionally many of the fields discussed in Landry are similar to the fields disclosed in Matson. Therefore since database systems are adapted to support multiple field types one of ordinary skill in the art would implement fields that would provide for greater profitability.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Ajay Bhatia



Conferees:



JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER